

A FARTHER
VINDICATION
OF THE
Soul's Separate Existence,
AND
IMMORTALITY.
IN
ANSWER
TO
Dr. C—'s FARTHER THOUGHTS
UPON HIS
SECOND THOUGHTS
Concerning
HUMAN SOUL.

696 P. 3
10

In which is shewn from the plain Evidence of Holy Scripture, that Man has an Immortal Spirit in him, a distinct Substance from the Body; together with some Occasional Reflections on the Condition of Men in an Intermediate State.

By JOHN TURNER, M. A. Lecturer of *Christ-Church*, London.

L O N D O N:

Printed for *John Wyat*, at the *Rose* in *St. Paul's-Church-Tard*. 1703.

THE NEW YORK

AND NEW

AMERICAN

LIBRARY

OF THE

NEW YORK

AND NEW

AMERICAN

LIBRARY

OF THE

NEW YORK

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

THE Introduction.	page 1.
I. The State of the Question.	4
II. The Evidence of the Soul's being a distinct Immortal Substance from the Consent of Mankind.	5
A regard to be had to the Opinions of those who have lived before us.	ibid.
The Evidence from Holy Scripture considered.	6
The Sum of this point depends on the True and Authentick Interpretation of some Places produc'd in Proof of our Opinion.	
Some Rules to be observed in this; as,	9
1. What Relation Mens Expressions must be supposed to have to their Opinion of things.	ibid.
Dr. C—'s Argument, Soul is Life, and Life is Soul, considered in a Parallel Instance.	11
2. It's improbable that Inspired Writers should often express themselves in a manner favourable to Opinions which they know to be Erroneous.	12
Much more improbable that Christ Jesus should express himself in words so suited to the Opinions of the Jews, as should Naturally tend to lead them into an Error, which he knew inconsistent with the Religion that he came to Establish;	13
3. The Jews for many Ages had the same Opinion of the Soul that we have, Evidenced in Moses, Saul and Solomon.	15
A 2	The

The CONTENTS.

<i>The Interpretation of Eccles. xii. 7. vindicated.</i>	18
<i>All the Notion which the Jews had of a Future State, was by the Soul's Immortality, and express'd by the word Resurrection.</i>	ibid.
<i>The Difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees, was upon this very point.</i>	19
<i>The Question put to Christ by the Sadducees, had respect to this very point.</i>	20
<i>Christ's Answer and Argument from these words, I am the God of Abraham, &c. An undeniable Proof of this matter.</i>	
<i>4. That Interpretation of Scripture which is not to be supported without a supposition of an extraordinary Miraculous Antecedent Resurrection is unreasonable.</i>	22
<i>The Antecedent Resurrection of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, is precariously supposed, and without Proof.</i>	23
<i>Is contrary to Scripture.</i>	24
<i>Christ's words to the Penitent Thief, and St. Paul's desire to be with Christ, most reasonably to be understood in a Sense agreeable to the received Opinion of the Soul.</i>	26
<i>The Apostles continue to express themselves in favour of a distinct Immortal Spirit.</i>	ibid.
<i>Dr. C—'s Evidence Examined over again.</i>	27
<i>'Tis not unusual to speak by words that refer to the Person of a Man, when one half part only is intended. This proved by Examples.</i>	ibid.
<i>The words of Job xiv. 7. &c. considered.</i>	30
<i>The Expressions of David, Psal. 6. 5. and Hezekiah, Is. 18. 8. not repugnant to our Opinion.</i>	31
<i>Eccles. iii. 19. Reflected on again.</i>	32
<i>The Parable of the Tares belongs to that Objection which concerns the General Resurrection.</i>	33

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. II.

III. T HE Difficulties Objected on each side.	34
Our Opinion not contrary to the Principles of Christianity.	ibid.
All Difficulties that may be started, do not amount to an Inconsistency with Truth.	ibid.
Probable Conjectures founded on the Nature of things in Difficult Matters are reasonably to be allow'd.	37
1. Our Opinion of the Soul does not overthrow the necessity of the Resurrection of the Body.	38
The Reason and Necessity of things not alway evident to us.	39
The Resurrection of the Body necessary to the completing our Happiness or Misery.	40
2. Our Opinion not Inconsistent with a General Judgment.	ibid.
It is not Probable that Men are Adjudged to Heaven or Hell immediately upon their Decease.	41
The Dead may have Joy or Torments in an intermediate State.	42
The Scriptures favour this Opinion.	43
Nothing in it inconsistent with the Justice of God.	ibid.
Faln Angels do continue in an intermediate State till the last Judgment,	44
And are in Torment in those their Infernal Prisons.	45
3. Our Opinion gives no just Countenance to Purgatory, or Prayers for the Dead, or Invocation of Saints.	45
4. Nor makes void any of God's Promises.	46
5. Nor perplexes the Mystery of Christ's Incarnation.	47
The Difficulties on Dr. C——'s side more considerable.	48
1. His	

The CONTENTS.

1. *His Notion admits of no sufficient Punishment for the Actual Sins of Men, but in consequence of our Redemption.* 49
Redemption should rather suppose a State of Misery, from which we are Redeemed, than prepare one that was not before. 50
2. *This derogates much from the Great Work of our Redemption, and is especially disagreeable with the Gospel Account of our being Redeemed from the Misery of our own Sins.* *ibid.*
From the Propriety of calling it a Covenant of Grace. 51
3. *His Opinion utterly inconsistent with the Resurrection of the same Person.* 52
That seems necessarily to require that the Principle of Life and Sensation be Preserved undissolved. 53
Dr. C——'s Notion of it, is a new Creation, not a Resurrection. 54
4. *His Notion disagreeable to the Sense of the Ancients about Christ's Descent into Hell.* 55
5. *His Notion Countenances Wicked Men in their Sins. An Indemnity for a time makes threatened Punishment lose it's Effects.* *ibid.*
This Evident in the distant Expectations of Death. 56
Perverse Sinners want such Terroures most, and suffer most in the removal of them. 57
His Doctrines when laid together, tend much to destroy the Efficacy of Christianity. *ibid.*
The Conclusion. *ibid.*

A FARTHER

VINDICATION

OF THE

Soul's Separate Existence,

AND

IMMORTALITY.

CHAP. I.

HAD I not firmly resolved to bring this Treatise into as short a Compass, as the Cause I defend will possibly admit; my Adversary might have expected from me a Preface; to have vindicated my self from a great many things that he has unreasonably laid to my Charge: And to have satisfied the World of the Injustice of his Complaints against me. But this would inevitably have drawn me out to a considerable Length. He has not only glanc'd
 a Reflection of Biggotry, and Prejudice, and Ignorance, Pref. p. 3,
6.
B and

Far. Th. and an *Erroneous Unchristian Zeal* upon almost the
 p. 3. whole Tribe of us; but he complains loudly of *Scurrilous Railings*, and *Unchristian Reflections from the Pulpit and the Press*. And nothing less is made the distinguishing Mark of my Character, than a boundless *Passion*, a *passionate Unchristian Zeal*, that I ought to be *purified from at the Refiners Fire*, that I may offer *unto the Lord an Offering of Righteousness to atone for this Offence* against *Estibius*, as he loves to call himself, tho' his Name is to me as *Whimsical* as his *Notion*. If all this be intended against me, I must desire Dr. C— to be assured, that I never troubled the Pulpit with this *Controversie*, whatever I have done the Press. And as to that Performance, which he charges with such *Exorbitant Passion*, if I were conscious to my self of any *Undecent, Unchristian Expression* in it, I would beg my Adversary's Pardon for it.

But besides all this, he is frequent in his Complaints
 Preb. p. 8. of *Enmity, Hatred*, and a *Spirit of Persecution* against him, and unhappy is he to have to do with such *ignorant Zealots*, as answer the Character of *Bishop Bonner*, and think *Fire and Faggot* the best way of *Illuminating the Understanding*: when his Arguments are too *knotty to be resolved*. I was at a loss when I read such things as these; not being able to imagine how I was, or could be possibly, concerned in them. I could have no great hatred of a Person whom I never knew, nor had any Dislike of, but for this Book, and never shew'd any farther Indignation against him on that account, than the Publishing my Reasons, why I could not be of his Opinion, but thought it a Mistake. In answer to which he has, in a Way of Dialogue, made a great many wise Speeches for me, that I ray self could never

ver have devis'd; brought me in espousing Notions that I never thought of; and given the Arguments I us'd such wild Turns, and such an odd extravagant Air, as makes them, I confess, very well answer the Character that he is pleas'd to give them in his Title-Page; *Weak Efforts* upon my Word, and as he has represented them, very Foolish and Contem-
ptible.

All this I forgive him; and shall leave it to the Reader, to judge between us as he sees fit; my present Design being only the Clearing my Reasons from any serious Exceptions that he has made against them, or the setting them in a clearer View to his Eye and Observation: that it may thereby be the more easily determined, whether Dr. C— or I, have given the more Rational and True Account of the Soul of Man. To this end it will be proper for me to shew,

I. The true State of the Controversie; and how far we understand each other Right, as to the Question in Dispute.

II. What is the just Force of the Evidence produc'd on each Side.

III. Lastly, What are the Difficulties or Absurdities, that we charge each other with, as consequent upon the Opinions that we defend.

These things fairly stated will, I think, make it tolerably easie for any Impartial Reader to determine on which Side Truth, and on which the *Weak Efforts* are most certainly to be found. And I hope I shall be able to give a fair Account of them without either *Passion, Prejudice, or Biggotry.*

Far. Th. I. How far we are agreed as to the true State of
 p. 8. the Controversie. For my Adversary tells me that I
 have *mistaken the whole point of it; the Question being,*
Whether Man is Composed of Body, and an Immaterial
Substance called Soul: not whether that Immaterial Sub-
stance be Immortal. I grant that the Question is about
 the Soul's being *a distinct spiritual Substance; And*
 wherein have I mistaken it? Is it because the Title
 of the Book bears, *The separate Existence and Immorta-*
lity of the Soul, and that I had occasion to speak often
 of its *Immortality?* Why, if I find such Expressions in
 Scripture, from whence I cannot but conclude both
 these Doctrines to be true, it was, I hope, no Blun-
 der to put them both together. Especially when
ibid. p. 8. Dr. C— himself grants, *That if such a Substance be*
once proved, Immortality follows of course. I own then
 that his Side of the Question is, *That Man is not com-*
posed of Body and another Immaterial Substance, called
Soul; Mine is, That Man is composed of Body, and a
spiritual Substance called Soul, which is Immortal, that is,
never dies.

We are agreed then, I think, in this; saving
 that, on his Side, he has thrust upon me a Word,
 which I do not remember that I ever used. I own
Body and Spirit to be Distinct things, and to be distin-
 guished by incommunicable Properties. But because
 it is a Question in Philosophy, what the incommuni-
 cable Properties of *Matter and Spirit* are, and such
 wherein all Men are not agreed; I purposely avoided
 the Word *Immaterial*, that I might not mix any of
 the Doubts and Uncertainties of Philosophy with this
 Debate. So little Reason had Dr. C— to censure me,
Preb. p. 16, for building on *Philosophical Notions* and Niceties; and
 17, &c.

to

to bring me in as *Preaching to the People to take care of their Immaterial Substances, and looking on all as Fools or Dotards, who profess themselves incapable of comprehending what he means.* I thought I had with sufficient Caution avoided all Occasion of such Reflections. I am Content to affirm that the Soul of Man is a *Spiritual Substance Distinct from the Body:* without being Peremptory as to its Specific Nature and Properties. And whether Man has such a Soul or no, is the true State of the Controversie between us.

II. The second thing is the just Force of the Evidence, produced by him and me, in Defence of the Opinions we maintain. And here he cannot deny me,

First, That I have the Generality of Mankind for a great many Ages together, on my side. Whereupon I could not but put the Question, *How he came to be Wiser than his Forefathers, and to have a Gift of Interpretation of Scripture above other Men?* I could not but think that there is a Venerable Regard to be had to the Opinions and Principles of those that have lived before us: Especially to those that have been receiv'd in the brightest Ages for Learning and Knowledge, and the Advantages of Divine Revelation. And among Mighty Numbers in all Ages of the Church, who have read the Holy Scriptures with as careful an Eye, as piercing a Judgment, and as serious a Concernment for Truth, and to detect all Errours prejudicial to Christianity, as *Estibius* can pretend to: That he alone should hit upon this New Discovery, with all the Convincing Clearness of Demonstration, has great shew of Paradox and Mystery. His Opinion is *contrary to the Sentiments of*

Far. Th
p. 16.
Nine

A Farther Vindication of the Soul's

Nine Parts in Ten of Mankind in all Ages. And so says he, *There was a time when Nine Parts in Ten of the World, and more abundantly, believed Idolatry. How Ancient is Idolatry? How many hundred Years old is Mahometism? Antiquity gives no indeleble Stamp to the Truth of an Opinion.* I grant it, and I never urg'd this in his Peremptory way of Mathematical Certainty: But only, that Opinions so Universally received, ought not upon trifling Niceties to be rejected. Could this Author have brought such Arguments against Man's having a distinct Soul, as the Scripture affords against Idolatry, It will not be denied, but that Antiquity must have given way to him. But,

Far. Th.
Pref. p. 11.
Far. Th.
p. 35.

Secondly, This Opinion has not only the General Consent of Men, but a good appearance of the Authority of Holy Scripture to favour it. Dr. C— confesses that there are Texts that *seem to prove the Soul a Distinct Substance if taken literally, as there do for Christ's Real Presence in the Sacrament,* meaning Transubstantiation, I suppose. But, says he, Take words literally, and we read of *a Lean Soul, a Fat Soul, and a Thirsty Soul.* From whence he concludes, that such Scriptures are not to be taken according to the Letter, but to the Author's Design in those Places. And thus *Soul* and *Spirit* are used to Denote either the Person spoken of, or their Life, or their Affections, but nothing like a Distinct Spiritual Substance. To all these things I Reply,

1. By agreeing that Scripture-Texts are not always to be taken in their literal Sense, but that whenever we find an evident Absurdity, or Contrariety therein to Common Sense, or the plain Meaning of other Scriptures, we must find out some other Interpretation. And if Dr. C— can give as good Exceptions,
and

and Reasons against the Soul's being a distinct Immortal Substance, as are to be brought against Transubstantiation, I promise to become his Convert: And I assure him I will make as Diligent and Impartial an Inquiry after them as I can.

2. I agree with him farther, That some of those Texts which seem to favour our Notion, were intended only to Denote the Person, or Life of the Person spoken of, or the like. When *Abraham* is said to have taken *with him all the Souls that he had gotten in Haran*, Gen. 12. 15. I confess that no more seems intended than that he took with him so many Persons. And to *make an Atonement for Souls*, Exod. 30. 15. may perhaps be designed for no more than to make an Atonement for their Lives. But I must add,

3. That it is not always so. There are several Places both in the Old and New Testament, in which the words *Soul* and *Spirit* are particularly intended to signify a Substance distinct from the Body. Such I think, is that of *Eccles. 12. 7.* where *Solomon*, speaking of a Man when he dies, says, *then shall the Dust or Body return to the Earth as it was, and the Spirit shall return to God that gave it.* Dr. C— would understand no more by this, than the Power of Life centring again in God upon Man's Death. And yet I cannot but believe, in spite of all that he has offer'd to the contrary, That *Solomon* intended more than this: That he did intend the Soul's returning to God as a distinct Substance from the Body. I granted on this occasion, that *if there had been incontestable proof of Man's having no such Soul, the Doctor's Interpretation might have been admitted.* Meaning thereby, and indeed Declaring, that any difficult Scriptures, as this in such a Case would have been, must be interpreted in
a manner

a manner agreeable to the certain Evidences which Men have of things. In which we often are forced to go off from the Literal Sense, and to be content with such other Meaning as the Words will best seem to bear. And this I mention'd as the only Case, that can give countenance to his construction of the Words. For this the Dr. exposes me, and Scoffs at it, as *fine indeed*, and a *rare confession*, that when *a thing is incontestably prov'd*, I will *Grant it to be true*. I wish that Dr. C— would do as much. And if he keeps to my intention, I have no reason to be asham'd of what I said. His construction of this place ought not to be admitted on any proof less than That. He that contradicts Opinions almost Universally received, and pretends to demonstrate that they are Erroneous; He ought to bring incontestable Evidence, or he will come short of what he pretends to. And he that gives up long Establish'd Principles, upon every new devised Interpretation of Scripture-Texts, without considering whether the Proofs be necessarily conclusive; He yields too fast, and may soon make the Holy Scripture to prove any thing, or nothing.

I cannot therefore but still insist upon it, that the Plain and Literal Sense of this place, ought to be allow'd as most agreeable to *Solomon's* Intention, and as having nothing in it Unreasonable, or Absurd. And if it be, *Solomon* apparently declares in favour of our Opinion.

Hold, says Dr. C—, It is absurd to suppose the *Souls of the Wicked to return into the Presence of the Holy God*. To which I answered before, That *this does not necessarily suppose into his Presence and Favour, but only unto his Disposal*; that is, To the place allotted by him for deceased Souls. This, says Dr. C—, is
capable

Separate Existence and Immortality.

9

capable of so many meanings, that at this rate the Souls of Beasts may be said to return to God. And I pray, Good Dr. may not the Souls of Beasts, be said to return to God according to your Notion? For, does not the Power of Life in Beasts, Return and Center again in God when they die, as well as the Power of Life in Men? What Difficulty is there then in my Interpretation more than there is in yours?

Far. Th.
P. 35.

But not to trouble the Reader any longer with these our Piqueerings at each other; I will here observe, that the Dispute is brought so far between us, as in great measure to determine in this; Which of us gives the Truer and more Authentick Interpretation of this, and and a few other Texts produc'd in this Cause. Which of us is found to do this, must doubtless have the Truth on his Side; and to the more easie Determination of this matter, I would recommends four things to be well consider'd.

I. What is commonly thought to give occasion to any Authors, to use such and such Expressions? And what Relation their Words must be supposed to have to their Knowledge and Opinion of things? For Example, Had the Inspir'd Writers any Knowledge or Cognizance of that Opinion of Souls, which I am now defending, or had they not? If they had, 'tis much in favour of our Construction of their Words. And if they had not, 'tis yet more strange that they should use the very same way of Expressing themselves in such Matters, as those Authors always use, who have Knowledge of, and Believe this Doctrine. And indeed their using such Expressions in such a manner, is a good Evidence that they had Knowledge of, and Believed the same Doctrines about the Soul that we do. For tho' Words, are often used in a figurative Sense, and

C

with

A Farther Vindication of the Soul's

with great Liberty, yet they are not originally taken up at Random, but with regard to the Opinions which Men have of Things: without which they would be Wild and Monstrous and Unaccountable. *Virgil* and *Ovid* had never used *Pinus* for a Ship, if they had never heard of any Ships built of that Sort of Wood; And *Moses*, I am perswaded, had never used the Word *Soul* for Person, or Life, if the Soul had not been known, or, at least, not believ'd to be the Fountain and Principle of Life in every Person.

And this Consideration will let us in, to see the Fal-lacy of that Remark which Dr. C— seems to have laid down as the Foundation of this New Discovery, *viz.* That the Word *Soul*, in Scripture, signifies no more than Life, or Person: *Soul* is *Life*, and *Life* is *Soul*; and *so it can be neither a Distinct Substance, nor Immortal*. I thought this but a trifling Argument, for altho' it is not to be deny'd but that the Sacred Penmen when they use this Word, do sometimes intend no more by it, than Life; yet if the Reason of such Expression comes to be consider'd, it must be concluded, that *Soul*, on all such occasions, is used figuratively, or Tropically, if the Doctor had rather that I should call it so; and must be look'd on as the Principle of Life in the Person so spoken of. This Dr. C— calls *Nice and Critical*, but still he thinks it an evident *Demonstration, that if Life and Soul are the same thing, it is neither a Substance, nor Immortal*. But how will he prove Life and Soul to be the same thing? And yet this is his *Medium*, which he must prove to make good his Conclusion. And it is not enough to say, That *Soul* is used when no more than Life is intended. This is not sufficient; for let us try it a little in the fore-mentioned Instance of a Ship and a Pine.

Virgil,

Separate Existence and Immortality.

II

Virgil, speaking of a vast heavy Ship, has these Words,

————— *Sed pondere Pinus*

Tarda tenet —————

*Æn. v.
l. 153.*

and the Notes upon *Pinus* have, *Navis è Pinu facta*, giving us to understand, that the Ship was call'd so from the Wood, *Pine*, of which Ships used formerly to be built; and that the Poet intended no more in this place, than that *Cloanthus* had a very heavy sluggish Ship: the Thing being called by the Name of the *Matter* out of which 'tis made. Upon which, up starts some wise *Estibius*, and tells us, That we are all misled by our faulty Commentators; That there is no such thing in Nature as *Pine-Wood* a distinct Substance from a Ship; That this is all a Heathenish Invention, and a Lying Tradition. That the Poet meant no more by *Pine*, than a *Ship*; That *Pine* is *Ship*, and *Ship* is *Pine*; and there can be no such Thing as *Pine-Wood* a distinct Substance from the Ship. Will this Man, with his new Device at last, have the World think that he argues like a *Man* and a *Scholar*, and deserves rather to to be rewarded than laugh'd at? And yet this is exactly the Demonstration that *Estibius* produces under this Head; That *Life* is *Soul*, and *Soul* *Life*; and therefore 'tis evident, even to Demonstration, That *Soul cannot be a distinct Substance, and Immortal*. Far. Th.
p. 10.
p. 26.

Whatever Liberty then Men may use in accommodating Words to their Occasions, the first Rise of 'em proceeds from the Notions and Opinions which they have of Things. He that had never heard of Ships built of *Pine*, would never call a Ship by that Name; and he that had never heard of such a thing as a *Soul* that is a distinct Substance from Body, could scarce

possibly write in such a manner, as shall seem not only in its Literal Meaning, but in the most obvious Design and Intention of the Author, to favour the Belief of such a Substance. But,

Far. Th.
p. 16, 17,
18.

2. It is much more improbable still, that any Divine Writer should express himself thus, if he knew such an Opinion to be commonly received, and yet Erroneous and Dangerous to Religion. Dr. C — affirms the Original of this Notion to be from the *Egyptians*, and that too before the days of *Moses*; and that *Moses* knew it to be a *Doctrine purely Heathenish, a Heathenish Principle, and inconsistent with the Jewish Religion*. I do by no means agree with Dr. C — about the Original of this Doctrine; but I need not Contest this Point with him, when his own Notion turns against him. For did *Moses* know of such a Doctrine, and believe it False and Heathenish, and contrary to true Religion, and yet speak of the Soul in such manner, as the very *Egyptians*, who believed it a distinct Substance, could scarce use plainer words on such Occasions; *Credat Judæus Apella, non Ego*. I grant that, in things meerly Philosophical and Indifferent, and no way influencing the Principles of Religion, Those that write by Divine Inspiration may accommodate their Expressions to the Capacities and Opinions of the People. But it is a Difficulty which, I confess, I cannot get over, that they should do thus in Notions Prejudicial to true Religion. And I can rather believe ten Thousand *Estius's* deceiv'd, and taking that Opinion to be Erroneous and Dangerous, which is not so; than that either *Moses, David, Solomon*, or any other, who writes by Divine Inspiration, would use Expressions apparently in favour of a Principle, which they at the same time know to be False, Heathenish, and Dangerous to the Religion which

which they profess'd. I cannot but conclude, rather that they, when they so express'd themselves, did both Believe and Know the Principles so Apparently favour'd, to be true. Especially if we bring this Observation down from *Moses, David and Solomon*, and the Prophets, to the most Perfect Preacher of Righteousness, Jesus Christ the Son of God. Dr. C— often mentions, and lays great stress upon the Remark; that our Notion of *Humane Soul is inconsistent with the true Principles of the Christian Religion*. This is, I confess, an Important Objection, and the force of it shall be considered by and by. But in the mean time let's reflect a little. Did Christ know such a Notion to be contrary to and inconsistent with that Religion which he came to Establish? Did he also know that Notion to be Universally own'd and believ'd by the Pharisees, and the far greater Number of his own People? And did he yet frequently mention *Soul* and *Body* as distinct from each other; in the very manner that the Pharisees themselves would have spoken on those occasions, and in such a manner, as they who believed the Soul a Distinct Substance, could not but think consonant to, and in favour of such their Principles? Let *Estibius* lay these things together, and Reconcile these Questions, which are matter of Fact, with his Assertion. From several of Christ's Expressions which seem apparently in favour of this Opinion, when he might easily have delivered himself in other words, and when he could not but be sensible how the Pharisees and Generality of the Jews must understand him; I cannot but conclude, That he knew this Opinion, of the Soul's being a Distinct Substance, to be True, and was willing that it should be received as such. Why else did he not, when he had so many fair occasions, expose this dangerous Error

Far. Th.
p. 9. Pref.
p. 17.

Error of the Pharisees, and the People that follow'd them? When he Complain'd of the unprofitable *Traditions* they had set up; and warn'd his Disciples to beware of their *Leaven* and Corrupt Doctrines: Why did he not, on such fair Opportunities, declare against this Dangerous Heathenish Invention? I cannot but think, that had he thought it so, he would so have done. When the Question put by the Sadducees led him to speak particularly of the State of the Dead beyond the Grave: Why did he not then set the Pharisees at Right, as well as the Sadducees; and correct the Immortal Substance of the one, as well as the others mistaken Notions about Marriages in another State? And yet instead of condemning this false Heathenish Invention, he Argues so plainly in favour of it, That we must have Recourse to a Miracle, to evade the manifest force of his Conclusions in its behalf. It is to me the greatest of Miracles, that the Son of God should Speak and Argue so evidently in favour of a Doctrine which he at the same time knew the People he lived among believed; if he had thought that very Doctrine inconsistent with the Religion which he came into the World to Establish: Or if he had not known that Doctrine to be a Useful and Profitable Truth. I recommended these Considerations to Dr. C— before, but he thought it Wisdom to pass them by.

Far. Th. Only as to one part of them he tells me, that I
 p. 53, 54. *write in haste, and wholly mistake the Matter of the Dispute with the Sadducees, while I make it between the Pharisees and them, when it was indeed between our Saviour and them: That I assert the Pharisees to have believed the Soul a Distinct Substance and Immortal, without any Proof from Scripture, and that I obtrude a meaning on our Saviour, which he never intended, in making the Argument*

Argument to determine in favour of the Soul's Immortality.

I will endeavour to set the Dr. right in all these Matters.

And first he cannot disown that I said expressly, That it was a Case which the Sadducees put to Christ. I Vind. p. 18.

did add indeed, That it seem'd one of the great Objections which the Sadducees brought against the Pharisees, in the Controversy that was between them. For I find plainly in Scripture that they were two Sects that opposed each other in these very Matters. The Sadducees denying that there was any Resurrection, or *Angel or Spirit*, but the Pharisees confess both. Both, *Act. 23. 3.* says Dr. C— but not one word of an Immortal Spirit in *Man*, *Eccl. Th. p. 54.*

No! See how Sharp some Men are to find out Errors that have lain Buried in the Ruins of many Ages, and yet over-look plain Truths that lie visible before their Face. For to satisfy even *Estibius* himself, if he be not too full of the Prejudices that he Complains of in others; I would shew him,

3. That the Jews in general, and especially the Pharisees, and *Solomon* in particular, had just the same Notions of Humane Soul, that we now have; and that Christ undeniably determined in favour of it.

As to *Moses*, Dr. C— himself declares his Knowledge of this Doctrine, but adds, that he lookt on it only as an *Aegyptian* Errour. This, I suppose, is Conjecture only; because he has brought no Proof of it. That such an Opinion was among the Jews in the Days of *Saul*, is plain, from the Story of his Consulting the Witch of *Endor*. This *Witch*, as we translate it, was one that used to tell Fortunes by a pretended Communication with the Dead: And how could any People possibly consult such, unless they believed the Souls of those dead Persons to be distinct Substances, and alive? And whatever it really was that

that appeared to *Saul*, 'tis plain that he took it to be the Ghost or Spirit of *Samuel*; for he speaks of it as such, 1 *Sam.* 28. 10, 14. and addresses himself to it as such: *And he said, Bring me up Samuel. And Saul perceived that it was Samuel, and he stooped down with his face to the ground, and bowed himself. And Samuel said unto Saul, I speaking in the Person of one deceased, Why hast thou brought me up? And ver. 19. the Apparition says, To morrow shalt thou and thy Sons be with me. With whom? With Samuel among the Dead.* Which yet had been an unintelligible Speech, had not *Saul* had an Opinion that *Samuel* had an Immortal Soul distinct from his Dead Body, which made this Discovery of his State. Here is, I think, sufficient Evidence what Notions the People of that Age had. However, lest Dr. C— should decry this their Opinion of the Soul's distinct and separate Existence for an Imposture and Delusion, as well as their Conceit of the Soul's being conjured up by this Necromancy; I will shew him that *Solomon* also, whose Words we now dispute, had the same Thoughts of Humane Soul, with us. For tho' our Adversary would have it, that He asserts the same End to Man and Beast, when he says, *Eccles. iii. 19, 20, 21. That as one dieth, so dieth the other, and they all go to one place; all are of Dust, and all turn to Dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of Man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the Beast that goeth downward to the Earth?* tho', I say, he would from hence inferr, that *Solomon* here asserts the same End to Man and Beast, and makes no Difference between 'em in their Death, being ignorant, as the Jews were, of the Resurrection: I will shew him, that he is here also mistaken; and puts such a Sense on these Words as that Wise King never could intend. There is indeed

Far. Th.
p. 60.

Ib. p. 60.

deed somewhat of difficulty in the Comparison which *Solomon* makes between the *Spirit of Man*, and the *Spirit of Beasts*. For tho' he distinguishes them by the ones going upward, and the other downward to the *Earth*: yet still he seems, will *Estibius* say, to make the one as much a distinct Substance as the other; and so must either prove that both of them have such a distinct Soul, or neither of them. Why, What if I should say, that the Souls of Brutes are Spirits of an inferiour Nature; I should not be alone in that Opinion, nor can he easily Confute me, or bring any of his boasted Demonstrations against it. But I need not say thus, 'tis enough to make out that whatever Notion or Opinion *Solomon* had of the Souls of Beasts, He most certainly had the same that we have of the Souls of Men. And for this let Dr. C— consider, That as I agree with him, that the Jews, and *Solomon* with them, were ignorant of the Future Resurrection of the Body; yet they did not think that *Man dies like a Beast*, but had a Belief and Apprehension of another State after Death, in which they were to be Happy or Miserable, according as their Lives had been Good or Bad. What else can Dr. C— make of those words; *But if a Man* Eccles. x. 8. *live many Years and Rejoyce in them all; yet let him remember the days of Darknes, for they shall be many?* What are those *Days of Darknes* that are therefore to be remembered because *they shall be many*? And why are they to be so particularly regarded? The very next words inform us: *Rejoyce, O Young Man, in thy Youth, let thy Heart chear thee in the days of thy Youth, and walk in the ways of thy Heart, and in the sight of thine Eyes: but know that for all these things, God will bring thee to Judgment.* v. 9. Here's the Reason why those days of Darknes are to be Remembered and Considered; And can

any Man now believe, that *Solomon* asserts *the same end to Men and Beasts*? I leave it to all the Learning and Judgment of Dr. C—, who has a fine knack at New Discoveries; How one that knows nothing of the Resurrection of the Body, and yet plainly owns a Future State after Death, in which Man must receive Rewards or Punishments, can be thought to believe Death to be the same thing in Man and Beast; Or how these things can be Reconciled, without Confessing that this Divine Writer did apprehend the Soul of Man to be a distinct Immortal Substance?

Eccles. xii.
7.

And now let us bring all this to that Passage cited in favour of the Soul of Man as a distinct Substance from the Body, *Then shall the Dust return to the Earth as it was, and the Spirit shall return unto God who gave it.* And consider fairly and impartially, whether of our Interpretations agrees best with the Intention of this Divine Author. Mine, which suits very well with such a Meaning, as he has undeniably declared in favour of in other Places; or His, which puts such a Construction upon all Passages produc'd in this Cause, as can never be Reconciled with the avow'd Principles of this Author. For how can it be, that he should believe *the same end to Man and Beast*, who calls upon Men to expect Rewards and Punishments after Death, especially having no knowledge of the Resurrection of the Body; which both Dr. C— and I agree to have first been made known by the Gospel?

To confirm all this, I will go still a little farther, and desire Dr. C— to observe, That all the Apprehension which the Jews had of a Future State, stood upon this Bottom; That Mens Souls are distinct Substances and Immortal. I observed before from Dr. *Hammond*, That this is the very thing that the Jews meant by the Resurrection,

rection, having no knowledge of its extent to the Body; Br. Viad. p. 20.
 And consequently, That when Christ convinced the Sadducees of a Resurrection by those words; *I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living*; he declared in favour of this very Doctrine that I am now defending. No, says Dr. C—, you write in haste, and mistake the Principles of the Pharisees, and making Christ to declare in favour Far. Th. p. 53.
 of them, *obtrude a meaning on our Blessed Lord, which he never intended.* For I am very sure, says he, That the Scriptures Testify no such thing, as that the Pharisees owned an Immortal Soul, or Spiritual Substance in Man: Act. 23, 5.
 but only that they believed Angels and Spirits. I will let Estibius see, That a Man in the height of his Confidence, may sometimes be mistaken. To this end I must put him in Mind, that the occasion of St. Luke's giving us an Account of the different Opinions and Notions of the Pharisees and Sadducees was, When St. Paul was call'd before the chief Captain at Jerusalem, and heard in his own defence; where observing that Act. 23, 6.
one Part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the Council, Men and Brethren, I am a Pharisee, the Son of a Pharisee, of the Hope and Resurrection of the Dead I am called in Question. The Reason of this Speech was to divide his Enemies among themselves, and gain the Pharisees to his side. And it succeeded accordingly; for the Divine Historian adds immediately, that *when he had so said, there arose a* ver. 7.
Dissention between the Pharisees and Sadducees, and the Multitude was divided. And lest any one should doubt how this Speech became the occasion of such Dissention, St. Luke tells us, that the Reason was, for that the Sadducees say there is no Resurrection nor Angel, nor Spirit, but the Pharisees confess both. Both what? Angels

and Spirits, and not the Resurrection also? How then came St. Paul's Belief of a Resurrection to cause this Dissention, and to gain the Pharisees to his Side? 'Tis plain, I think, beyond all Dispute, that the Word, *Both*, τοῦ ἀποστόλου, must include the Pharisees Belief of a Resurrection, as well as of Angels and Spirits. Well but, says Dr. C—, here is *not a Word yet of an Immortal Soul, a Spiritual Substance*. Patience, good Dr. neither is there a Word in all the Books of *Moses*, of a Resurrection from the Dead, and yet from thence Christ proves to the Sadducees the Truth of that Doctrine. Inference from Scripture is Scripture, or else Christ's Argument against the Sadducees had no Force. And from such a Proof, I hope to make it appear, not only that the Pharisees had the same Notion of Man's Soul that we have, but also that Christ has apparently determin'd in favour of it.

For let us consider again, what that Resurrection was which the Pharisees and Sadducees differ'd about. It must be either the future Resurrection of the Body, or else that future State after Death, which Dr. *Hammond* tells us they call'd the Resurrection. I know not a Third thing that could possibly be intended. The first it could not be; Dr. C— grants that the Jews had no Notion of it. The Resurrection then in Contest between the Pharisees and Sadducees, could be no other than that very Doctrine of a Future State, by the separate Existence of a distinct Immortal Soul. There remains no other Sense to be put upon the Resurrection of those, who knew nothing of the Rising of the Body. And accordingly *Josephus*, who knew very well the Sentiments of these two different Sects among his own People, tells us expressly of the Pharisees, that they *believe the Souls to be Immortal*, and

Ant. Jud.
l. 18. c. 2.
ἀθάνατον
τὴν ψαίαν
ἀθάνατον

to

Separate Existence and Immortality.

21

to be either Rewarded or Punished under the Earth, according to their Virtues or Vices in this Life; but the Sadducees Opinion is, That the Souls perish with their Bodies. πνεῦμα ὡς σὰρξ ἀπολλύται

And if nothing but Scripture-Proof will satisfy ἐν τοῖς
Dr. C—, let him consider well, what those Spirits (besides Angels Good and Bad,) were, which the Pharisees believed, and the Sadducees denied; and what Regard they had to a Dispute about the Resurrection? How came St. Luke, when he design'd to inform us how these two Sects differ'd about the Resurrection, to tell us, That one Sect of them maintain'd, and the other deny'd the Existence of Angels and Spirits? What had this to do in the Business of the Resurrection? It is to me much clearer than all *Estibius's* Demonstrations, that St. Luke's Design in this place, was to inform us, that this Difference between Pharisee and Sadducee about the Future State, was wholly founded on their Belief or Disbelief of the Existence of Spirits, and particularly of the Soul, as a distinct Substance from the Body. The Sadducees, who denied all Existence of Angels and other Spiritual Substances, in consequence of that Principle, denied also the Resurrection or Future State after Death, that the other Jews believed; because it depended wholly upon the Soul's being a distinct Spiritual Substance, and Immortal. The Pharisees, on the other hand, believed such a State after Death, in which Man was capable of Joy, or Torment: and they accounted for it by the Soul's being a distinct Substance, continuing in Life after the Dissolution of the Body. This, I think, is the only consistent Account that can be given of what is here said of the different Principles of these two Sects, and of the Propriety of mentioning their Belief and Disbelief of the Existence of Spirits. And if it be, I hope

hope I have satisfied *Estibius*, that I did not mistake the Pharisees Opinion, but have proved, and that from Scripture, notwithstanding all his Assurance to the contrary, that they believed the Soul of Man a distinct Spiritual Substance.

Far. Th.
p. 5.

Let us see then whether he has with Reason charged me to *have put a Sense upon Christ's Words, that he never intended.* Did not Christ intend his Argument for the Confutation of the Sadducees, who denied this Resurrection? And does it not plainly conclude for the Certainty of such a Future State as they disbelieved, and used to dispute with the Pharisees against? He then that determined against the Sadducees, determined for the Pharisees; because their Notions were directly contrary to, and inconsistent with each other. And if he determines for the Pharisees, he determines for the Soul's Immortality: This being that very Doctrine which the Pharisees believed, and the Sadducees denied.

4. Another considerable Argument on our Side, is, That, to avoid the plain Consequences of these Scriptures, my Adversary is put on such Shifts as are Precarious, Miraculous, and Unreasonable. When Christ, in Answer to the Sadducee, produces God's Words to *Moses, I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob*, and adds, to shew how those Words prove the Resurrection in Dispute, That *God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living*: Dr. C— could not but own, That this Argument, which Christ urges, must suppose *Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob* to be in some Sense alive, when God spake thus to *Moses*. This can be no other way, that I yet ever heard of, but either by the Life of a Soul existing separate from the Body, or else by the

the Real Resurrection of the Body. If the latter be Unreasonable, the former has the better of it.

But Dr. C— pleads earnestly, tho' not strongly, that they were Really and Bodily raised from the Dead at that time. And this Answer I cannot but reject.

First, Because it is Precarious, and without Proof. There is not any one Place in all the Bible, that mentions a Tittle of it, or looks that way: only *Eslibius's* Evasion of the Testimony of this, and one or two more Texts against him, wants such a Notion. He endeavours in his last Book to represent it, as a Probable Conjecture: but is not able to do that. To this end he pleads, That Christ must be understood to plead for the Resurrection of the Body, because the Souls which could not possibly die, *needed no Resurrection from the dead*, and made our Saviour's Words, *Now that the Dead are raised, improper*. To this I answer, That while it appears that the Jews express'd the Future State they believ'd, by that Word *Resurrection*, and could mean no other, because they knew no other: Improperities in Speech must not overturn known Opinions.

Secondly, That we may not call such an Antecedent Resurrection as he wants, *Miraculous*, he tells us, That *this may be done by the ordinary Providence of God, in Relation to himself, tho' not to us*. But what may be, may not be, and he offers at no Proofs. Saving that,

Thirdly, He produces some Passages of Christ, with respect to the Apostles, that have no regard at all to *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*. Then he would have *Moses and Elijah* raised in Body, or else they could not have been visible to Christ, and Peter, and James, and John, when Christ was Transfigured before them. But I think he might

A Farther Vindication of the Soul's

might as well have said, That the Witch at *Endor* raised up the Body of *Samuel*, when the Apparition appeared and spake to *Saul*. For why, is not one Spirit in its Nature as invisible as another? Here then, as to the Bodily Resurrection of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, when God spake to *Moses* of them: 'tis a meer Notion that has no Foundation of Probability, or Truth.

So also when he puts the Question, how it appears that the Penitent Thief, who was Crucified with Christ, was not also Bodily exalted to Glory with him; tho' I am in no Passion, yet I cannot but stand amaz'd, that a Man who pretends to Convince almost all the World of a Mistake, and to *Demonstrate* at last that they are so, when he comes to the main stress of the Cause, only starts a Miraculous Principle, and then asks how it appears otherwise. In the Solidity of these Proofs must lie the force of this Demonstration. But indeed his Demonstration is an empty Name, and his Notion an empty Nothing. For,

2. This Antecedent Resurrection which he wants so much, is contrary to Scripture, *Christ is the first born from the Dead*, and that not only as all are raised by his Power, but also, as none were raised to Life Eternal, I mean so as never to die again, Antecedent to the Passion and Resurrection of our Saviour. This I think *St. Paul* expressly enough confirms, when he says that *we shall be raised, every Man in his own order. Christ the first Fruit, and afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming*. Where he evidently asserts Christ to have been the first in Order that ever arose from the Dead. For tho' it's true that Christ raised several from Death among the Jews, to convince them by such

1 Cor. 15.

such Miracles of his Divine Commission, and to give Credit to his Doctrines: yet from these other Scriptures which thus declare him to have been *The First fruits of them that slept, and the first born from the dead*, we must necessarily conclude, that the others were only raised to a longer continuance here among the Living; and not so as never to die again. But there is one place more, which tho' Dr. C— has mentioned as favouring his New Supposition, it makes directly against him. It is *John 14. 2, 3. I go to prepare a Place for you, I will come again and receive you unto my self, &c.* which the Dr. would have to declare *Christ's Will to raise his Favourite Apostles and Disciples to Glory before other common Believers.* But why so? What can his going to prepare a Place mean, but by his Resurrection and Ascension, as our Mediator, to make a way for us to Rise from the Dead, and Ascend to Heaven also? And if this be it, we must observe, 1. This Preparation of the way was to be made by Christ for all Men as well as for the Apostles. And 2. That if Christ does indeed Prepare and Open the way for us; Then there could be no Resurrection and Ascension of *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, when God spake to *Moses* in the Bush, for the way was not then prepared. And let Dr. C— consider seriously, whether it might not be improved into a plausible Objection against this Fundamental Doctrine of Christianity, that our Resurrection was procured by the Passion, Expiation, and Resurrection of Christ: if at the same time we should suppose what he pleads for, *viz. That God ordinarily has raised some extraordinary Favourites by a Resurrection, even a long while antecedent to the Resurrection of Christ himself.* This is such an extravagant Conceit, that I appeal to the Reader, whether it does not

E look

look much more like a *Weak Effort*, than a convincing *Demonstration*. And if this Doctrine of an Antecedent Resurrection be indeed Precarious and Unreasonable, there is no sense in which *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob* can be said to have been alive, when God declared himself to *Moses* to be their God, but by that Immortality of the Soul which I have proved the Pharisees to have believed, and to have called by the Name of Resurrection, and which the Sadducees, to whom Christ gave this Answer, Universally denied.

And when these things are considered, it can be no difficulty how we are to understand Christ's Promise to the Penitent Thief; *This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise*; and *S. Paul's desire to depart and to be with Christ*. Much rather that they expected immediately upon their Death to be happy, in a way that *St. Paul* as a Pharisee had long believed, and Christ had apparently determin'd in favour of; than that he expected such an extraordinary Resurrection as has not one Title to favour it in all the Gospel.

These then are Reasons of our Believing the Soul to be a distinct Substance and Immortal. And they are such as I think are not easily to be rejected: Sure I am, that what *Dr. C—* has hitherto excepted against them is of little moment. And if he does think fit ever to trouble himself any more on this Subject, he ought particularly to account for all these things; and when his hand is in, it will be worth his while to tell us, how the Apostles of Christ, to whom by the Holy Ghost he *made known* all the necessary and important Doctrines of Christianity, should still continue to express themselves in such Phrases, as could not but tend to confirm Mankind in a Notion which they must know to be inconsistent with the Religion that they were sent

to Preach ; If Dr. C—'s Assertion be true, that a Soul Immortal by a distinct Existence, is contrary to Christianity. What was that that St. Stephen recommended to Christ, when he said, *Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit*? Was Act. 7. 59. it only the Power of Life centring again in God? (*i. e.*) a thing of Nothing, an empty Name. And when St. James tells us, *That the Body without the Spirit is* Jam. 2. 26. *dead*; does he not suppose that Spirit to be rather the Principle of Life, than Life it self? And what did St. Paul intend when he bids us *Glorifie God in our Body* 1 Cor. 6. *and our Spirits which are God's*: Does he not plainly 20. mention two Parts, of which Man was alway thought to be Compos'd? It is to me incredible, that they should by such Expressions apparently countenance a Principle which they thought to be Erroneous, and Inconsistent with Christianity.

I have now shewed the Dr. what Evidence we have of the Soul's being a distinct Substance and Immortal; And shall next do him the Justice to consider Impartially, the Force of what he brings on the other side, in Defence of his Opinion. And here, besides the Argument, *Soul is Life, and Life is Soul*, which has been considered already;

1. The first thing he Pleads, is, That when something is affirmed of *any Man or Person*, it must necessarily be understood of the whole Man, or Person: And that it is absurd to understand it of the Half part only. *Ex. gr.* When Job says, *That Man dieth and wasteth away*: He tells us, That this must necessarily be meant of the whole Man, Body and Soul too; and that it is Ridiculous Banter upon the Laymen to tell them otherwise. And upon this Notion he forms that his impregnable Syllogism, *What was to have been Immortal* Far. Th. Pref. p. 14. 1b. p. 16.

in a state of Innocence, became Mortal by Transgression; but whole Man, Body and Soul was to have been Immortal in a state of Innocence: ergo, The whole, Man, both Body and Soul, became Mortal by Transgression. Which, as I observed to him before, is nothing but a Fallacy under the words *Man* or *Adam*, which he will needs have whether Living or Dead, to include the whole, Whether Death does indeed put an end to both or no. Nay, so fond is he of this Notion, that he tells us in his Farther Thoughts, that if we suppose the Soul such an Immortal Being as we plead for; yet when Man sinned, and Death is made the Punishment of Sin, even this *Immortal* part, by the Death of the Man must become *Mortal*. Nay, farther yet, This very Notion shall be serviceable to him to bring the Body from Death, as well as the Soul to it, whenever he has occasion for it. For if God speaks to *Moses* of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob* as *Living*, along while after they had been Dead; these words *Abraham*, &c. must mean the *Persons* of *Abraham*, &c. and if their *Persons*, it must include the whole, and then to be sure *they were raised by an Antecedent Resurrection*. And again, When Christ says to the Penitent Thief, *This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise*; Do not you, says my Adversary, charge our Saviour with Folly, in saying, *Thou, to the Thief, when his Soul only could be meant by it?* So much stress does *Estibius* lay upon this single Notion, that when a *Person* is spoken of, it must inevitably include the whole *Man*, and not a half part only.

Let the Reader here observe, That all the Force of this Argument is taken, not from the Nature of things, but from the customary Forms of Speech. So that if I can but make it appear, that such Forms of Speech have been used as of *Persons*, when the thing spoken, has

Far. Th.
p. 60.

Far. Th.
p. 75.

Far. Th.
p. 49.

p. 54.

Far. Th.
Axiom.
14. p. 14.

has been literally true of one part of them only; I should hope methinks to offer something to the Conviction of Dr. C—, at least to the Satisfaction of all Impartial Judges. I had observed before, that it was *Customary in all Languages to call a part by the Name of the whole*; and sometimes the whole by the Name of that which is less than half of it. But this will not do with *Estibius*; Tell me, says he, but one Instance in the World, where Thou is apply'd to a part only, and you do your Work? Far. Th. What Work? Convince *Estibius* of the Weakness of his Efforts in this Cause? I should be pleased to contribute to his Satisfaction. And if an Instance in the first Person or in the third, will but be as good as in the second Thou, I'll try if I can, fit his Humour. Christ prays thus; *Father, Glorifie thou me with thine own self, with the Glory which I had with thee before the World was.* Joh. 17. 5. I hope that Dr. C— who seems to condemn the Socinians, will not deny that Christ when he spake thus, was God and Man united into one Person; and yet he here speaks of the Glory which He, the Person Christ, had with God before his Incarnation, nay, before the World was made. And, as I observed in my Vindication, p. 24. is not this speaking of a Person, when but a half part of that Person could be intended as to the thing spoken of? And St. Luke says of Christ, when he was but a Youth, *Jesus increased in Wisdom and Stature.* Luk. 2. And yet this could be strictly true, and intended only of that one half part of him, which was Man. Again, *They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him,* said Mary. Him? Whom? Her Lord; What Lord? Jesus: *Him* and *My Lord* must include the Person of Jesus; And could Mary call a Dead Corps her Lord, and believe him to be Jesus, which whether you believe an Immortal Soul

A Farther Vindication of the Soul's

Soul or no, was but one half of him? Here are then, we see, Instances in which a *Person* appears undeniably to be spoken of, and yet *but one half part intended*, if this would but *do the Work*. And this Work it does, it shews all the Proofs that Dr. C— raises upon this Foundation to be but Emptiness and Vanity. But, says he, *You confess you have not a second Paralell to this Case*; I do; but if Dr. C— will shew me any other Case in the World, that in the Opinion of Men is esteem'd Parallel to it, I dare engage to produce more Instances of such like Expressions and Forms of Speech. What does Dr. C— think *Saul* took the Apparition which he saw to be? Was it the Body of *Samuel* by an Antecedent Resurrection from the Witch of *Endor*? Or did he look on it as *Samuel's Ghost* only? As such he Reverences it; and the Historian calls him *Samuel* by Name. *And Samuel said, to Morrow thou shalt be with me.* And does this yet include the whole Person of *Samuel*? What shall we do now? Let's try if there be any other better Evidence behind.

1. Sam.
28.
v. 19.

Chap. 14.
7, 8.

2. He brings the words of *Job*, *There is hope of a Tree if it be cut down, that it will sprout again; but Man dieth and wasteth away; yea, a Man giveth up the Ghost, and where is he? As the Waters fail from the Sea, and the Flood decayeth and dryeth up; so Man lyeth down and riseth not till the Heavens be no more; they shall not be awaked nor raised out of their sleep: Which Dr. C— thinks a plain Proof, that Man will never live again, until the Resurrection, whereas we make him live in his Soul immediately after Death.* To this I had Answered before; that these are only *Poetical* and *Lofty Expressions*, intended to declare, that there is no Hope or Possibility of bringing a dead Man to life again; and consequent-

ly

Separate Existence and Immortality.

31

ly these words *have no regard at all to the state of Men beyond the Grave.* Dr. C— Replies, *What if they are lofty Phrases, are they not therefore truth?* I Answer, That such Poetical and Rhetorical Expressions are true in the intended sense of the Writer, but not alway in the literal. Christ tells his Apostles, that if *they had faith as a grain of Mustard-seed, they might say to this Mountain, remove hence to yonder Place, and it shall remove.* Not that they by their Faith could bring Mount Sion into Italy, and carry the Alps back to Jerusalem: But this Proverbial Expression means, That by their Faith in Christ, they should be enabled to do great Miracles, and such as they then thought impossible. The intended Sense is true, but the literal is not: And so also in Poetical strains. And therefore, before this Gentleman can make this Text at all to his Purpose, he must shew by good and convincing Reasons, that it was the Divine Writer's Purpose and Intention to declare what he observes from it, and that no other Interpretation can suit the Author's design, or else he falls short of his plain and certain Proof.

3. The Scripture says, That the Dead cannot praise God, nor give him Thanks. *For in Death, says David, there is no remembrance of thee; in the Grave who shall give thee Thanks?* And Hezekiah says, *The Grave cannot praise thee, Death cannot celebrate thee, they that go down to the Pit, cannot give thee Thanks.* Therefore, says Dr. C—, there must be an entire deprivation of all Life, or else the living Immortal Souls might praise God. But I cannot apprehend, that either of these two Kings had any other Intention in those words, than to declare that the visible Effects of God's good Providence to them, become an Occasion and Invitation both to themselves and

to

to all about them, and even to Posterity, to praise and magnifie him: Which occasion had been lost, had they perished in their Danger, as they apprehended they should have done. *In Death there is no remembrance of thee*: that is, in Death they had lost the present occasion of Remembrance and Praise. If this meaning does not please the Dr. as I find he is full of mighty Scruples; let him then suppose the most that he can suppose, that these Texts seem to interfere with those others, which appear in favour of our Opinion of the Soul. What is then to be done? Must we give up those Texts that are Evident and Plain, and that have been thought so for many Ages, and lose all the Meaning and Authority of them, for the sake of one, or two, or three that may be difficult, or that we cannot absolutely reconcile as we would? No sure: This is to undermine all Certainty. Let the Reader judge then, whether it be not more fit to content our selves with such tolerable Interpretations of an obscure Text, as have been, or can be found out, rather than upon the Account of any such seeming difficulty to give up those Scriptures, the meaning of which are Evident and Plain: So that Dr. C— can prove nothing certainly against us, from either of these Texts, unless he can make out, that no other Meaning, than that which he puts upon them, can be agreeable with the Design and Purport of them.

4. He pleads these words of Eccles. 2. 19, 20. *That which befalleth the Sons of Men befalleth Beasts, even one thing befalleth them. As dieth the one, so dieth the other, they have all one breath; so that a Man hath no preeminence above a Beast, all go to one place.* Where Dr. C— observes, that Solomon plainly asserts the same

Separate Existence and Immortality.

33

end to Man and Beast, as being ignorant of a Resurrection, Far. Th. p. 60. which the Jews were. In Answer to this, I observed before, that all which occurs in this Book, was not the real Thought and Opinion of the Preacher himself, but that he Vind. p. 32. often refers to the Opinions and Sentiments of others. And I have the Authority of no less a Man, than the Learned Grotius to Countenance me in what I so said. But our Nice Estibius thinks this is destroying the Authority of the Book, and leaves us at liberty to believe it or not. Far. Th. p. 62. But I see no reason for this conclusion; especially when he adds, as he commonly does, such Remarks on those Opinions as shew us the Folly and Mistake of them, when they are Erroneous and Mischievous.

But be this Observation of Grotius as it will, I have already shew'd Dr. C---, that this Text cited by him, to prove that Man and Beast have all one Death, and that Solomon knew nothing of a Resurrection, is all Mistake. In that he speaks plainly of a Future State to be Remembred and Provided for; *Let him remember the days of darkness, for they shall be many, and then God shall bring Men to Judgment.* I agree with Dr. C---, that neither Solomon nor the People of the Jews had knowledge of the Resurrection, if he means that of the Body. But then I must once more recommend it to his serious Consideration: Whether he that believes a Future State, and yet knows nothing of a Resurrection of the Body, must not be granted to have believed the Immortality and Distinct Existence of the Soul?

5. His Last Argument is from our Saviour's Parable of the Tares; in which under the Comparison of Matt. xiii. Harvest, is set forth the Final Judgment of the World, in which the Wicked are to be sever'd from the Just.

F

And

And our Notion of a Soul as a Distinct Substance entering upon Bliss or Torment immediately after Death, He thinks, not at all agreeable to that Account of the Last Judgment. It must here be considered, That this is an Argument brought, not in the way of direct Evidence, to prove that Man has no such Soul, but only by way of Absurdity; as tho' the one of these Principles was inconsistent with the other. However, it is a Difficulty of such mighty Moment to any Opinion, that it should seem inconsistent with the Gospel Account of the last Judgment, that the Force of it ought to be very well examined. I think it falls most properly under the last Head to be spoken to; and if Dr. C— will but permit me to refer it thither, I promise to consider the full Force of it with as much Impartiality to Truth, as he himself can desire me.

C H A P II.

III. **A**FTER the Evidence brought on each side, as direct Proof of what we severally maintain; I come next to the Absurdities or Difficulties that we charge each other with, as consequent upon our Opinions. And that it may be the better apprehended, what Force such ways of Reasoning have to the Determining such Points, there are two things to be considered in them. As,

1. It is not every Difficulty that we meet with in things of this Nature, and find it hard to Account for, that can with Reason be brought as Evidence against the

the Truth of them; but those only that amount to a direct Contrariety or Inconsistency. There is scarce any thing so Perfectly understood, but that when we come to enlarge our Enquiries into it, we shall find somewhat that we cannot exactly and satisfactorily unravel. But must we for this reason give up all the Knowledge we have, and part with all certainties for the sake of a few things that our Knowledge will not reach to? No sure. The Sadducees put a knotty Question to Christ, about a Man that should Marry several Wives, which of 'em must have her to Wife in the next World. Christ's Answer shews, That this pretended puzzle was wholly grounded on their Ignorance of the State of Mankind in another World, where Marriage has no Place. And the Difficulties that proceed from our want of Knowledge, must not conclude against the certainty of what we know. If indeed the Opinion in Dispute is inconsistent with some other Principle that is confessed to be true; so that the acknowledgment of the one, cannot admit the Possibility or Truth of the other: This is a good Objection, and of real Force. But then the Inconsistency of two such Opinions must be well made out by very clear and certain Evidence. For it is not our Incapacity to Answer every Question that may be Ask'd about the Manner or Reason of them, that will make them inconsistent. And these things must be well Attended to, when Dr. C— comes to make out what he has often pretended, *viz.* That our Notion of the Soul of Man, *is contrary to, and inconsistent with the Principles of Christianity.* This is a Material Objection, I confess; which if he once makes good, he is sure of having me on his side. But his pretended Inconsistency must first be very well prov'd.

Far. Th.
p. 27.

Far. Th.
p. 68.

I have made this Observation, That every one may see there is no Force against the Arguments mention'd above, in any of these difficulties which Dr. C— draws from the Nature of things, but imperfectly understood. As when he Argues from our having had no Discoveries of the other World, from those that are dead. I had Answered to this before; and tho' the Dr. thinks the Answer Ridiculous, and Laughs at it: yet I still abide by it, That as *very few ever have returned from the State of Death; Lazarus I mean, and a few more Miraculously rais'd*: So nothing can be inferr'd to the just Confutation of an Opinion so well Establish'd as ours, concerning Man's Soul, is; from our having no Knowledge whether they did relate any thing or no; and from our want of such Discoveries, as he seems to have expected from them. There are many things of this Nature, that we must be content to be ignorant of, and satisfy our selves with what is more clearly and certainly known. And no difficulties of this Nature are to be insisted on as Objections against the Truth of things that appear even but probably attested by other Evidence. So also when he would have it concluded, that *a Material Body cannot be united to an Immaterial Substance*, unless we can Account to him the manner of that Union. If such difficulties as these be admitted, we shall soon lose all manner of certainty. For I can find him out Men who are as much puzzled to conceive and apprehend how it's possible for Life and Thought to be impress'd on Matter, as he is to conceive how a Spiritual Substance can be united to a Body of Flesh. Difficulties of this Nature often lie more in the Opinions and Conceits of Men, than in the Inconsistency or Contrariety of things. In consequence of this, I must observe,

2. That

2. That in answering such Difficulties, we must not alway be put upon a Peremptory Proof, and Determination of every thing we hold, but sufficiently avoid the Absurdities charged upon us, if we shew that there are probable ways whereby they may be avoided. The first requires such an absolute and compleat Knowledge of things, as would indeed remove all Difficulties, and might prevent all Disputes, if it could be attained to; but in this our mortal State it cannot. The other is giving proper Conjectures in difficult Matters; which if they be not directly contrary to evident Truths, is all that can be required, *where we walk by Faith and not by Sight.* For Example; We that believe the Immortality of a distinct Soul, suppose every such Soul to be either in Happiness or Torment presently upon its Entrance into another State. Ay but, says *Eslibius*, *prove the Soul to be in Torment before a General Judgment*, and tell us *what Misery it suffers.* What Proof would this cautious Gentleman require? This is not a *Medium* laid down to prove the Soul a distinct Substance, but a Doctrine built upon the Supposition of its Truth. And methinks upon the Supposition of such a Soul, the Truth of this Doctrine wants no other Evidence, than what arises from the Nature of the Soul that is supposed. For the very Conviction of Guilt, and the sure Prospect of Future Mercy, or Future Punishment, which the Soul in such a State can scarce be thought destitute of, cannot but occasion either Misery or Joy. And in all such like Cases, a probable Conjecture rationally founded, that things may be thus, or thus, and especially favoured by some Scripture Expressions, is a sufficient Answer to all Difficulties that do not amount

mount to a direct inconsistency of things; without being obliged Peremptorily to determine how every thing shall happen in another State.

By these two previous Observations, which I think are both of them Reasonable and True, I doubt not but to make appear, that Man's Soul being a Distinct Substance from the Body, is not at all inconsistent with any of the Doctrines or Principles of Christianity. What are those Doctrines of Christianity which this Opinion of the Soul is pretended to be Repugnant to, or Inconsistent with? I can find but few such in all *Estibius's* Pretensions, and they are,

Far. Th.
p. 150.

1. The Resurrection from the Dead. For says, *Estibius*, if as soon as we are born, we have in us an Immortal Soul that cannot die, we by Consequence Live again, as soon as we are Dead, which is in Effect not only a Resurrection, but something more Advantageous, in as much as our better Part, our Soul, never tastes of Death at all, but we go to Heaven alive, as to all Intents and Purposes in a purer State, as being Spiritual, and more capable of Serving God, who is a Spirit, than if we carried our Bodies with us. Now what need then of a Resurrection? And is this at last all the Result of this long Complication of Objections; only what need is there then of a Resurrection? I lookt for something that would bid fair to prove that an Immortal Soul and a Resurrection from the Grave in the Gospel Sense, were things that could not in Nature possibly consist together. That they were like Light and Darknes, or Fire and Water, one of which does alway destroy the other: And this would have been a Pretence that had deserved serious Consideration. Instead of this he only puts us off with an Appearance of its being unnecessary.

But

But to whom, I pray, does the Resurrection on this Account appear unnecessary? To *Estibius* it seems, and possibly to some others, but not to the generality of Mankind. Or if it did seem so to all of us, must two things manifestly declared in the Gospel be presently condemned as inconsistent, and one of them be rejected as false, only because the shallow Reason of Men cannot account for the Necessity of them both? May not that be thought Necessary with God, that does not appear so to Men? Such a pretence can never prove any Doctrine inconsistent with Christianity; because there may be such Reasons and Necessity for both these things, as we cannot at Present be able to find out. It is then methinks a sufficient Answer to this pretended Difficulty, that there is no apparent Repugnancy in these two things; a *Distinct Immortal Soul*, and a *Future Resurrection of the Body*; but only some particular Men, upon a Supposition of the one, cannot discover the Necessity of the other. But then, why may not this be from the Ignorance, or Mistakes, or Prejudices of Men, rather than from any real Inconsistency in the things themselves?

For what Reasons has *Estibius* assign'd against the Necessity of a Resurrection? Because Man's Condition, as we suppose, is *more Advantageous* without it: Why so? Because the *Soul*, the *better part*, goes immediately to Heaven, to all Intents and Purposes in a Purer State, as being Spiritual, and more capable of serving God, than if they carried their Bodies with them? But what if the Soul does not go immediately to Heaven? 'Tis common, I own, to talk thus of going immediately to Heaven or Hell; yet if Dr. C— considers, he will find the generality of Fathers, and Modern Divines, when they discourse of this Matter with Exactness, to be of another

Bar. Th.
p. 150.

another Opinion. And again, Tho' the Soul be the *better part of Man*, yet still it is *but a part*; and tho' he may vainly conceit it Advantage to be rid of such a clog; yet I hope he remembers that *An integral part can never be a clog to the whole, of which it is a part*. And the Body is as much an Integral part of the Man, as the Leg is of the Body. So that in short there can be no just Plea against the Necessity of a Resurrection, while the Happiness of Men is supposed Imperfect without it: And Man's Happiness is granted not to be in Perfection in a state of Separation. The Resurrection therefore of the Body is necessary, that the Happiness of Man may have its full Accomplishment. For whatever Joys the Soul may partake in a state of Separation, that Felicity must be Imperfect; because Man himself is not yet Compleat. And this I think is a sufficient Answer to the first Objection.

2. The second Difficulty is, That our Opinion of the Soul is inconsistent with the Christian Account of *the General Judgment*. This is Matter of great Moment, I confess, if it can be made good; but wherein lies the Inconsistency? Why, says *Estivius*, upon several Accounts. For First, *The Scripture says expressly, That the Judgment is not to be till the end of the World; but by making Souls go to Heaven or Hell immediately after Death, you antedate that Judgment*. Secondly, You make God to *prejudge and precondemn Sinners to Torments without Examination, which is inconsistent with his infinite Justice*. Dr.C— means, That these Inconsistencies will follow, if we suppose all Mankind immediately upon their Death to be *Adjudg'd* to Heaven or Hell. But who, I pray, supposes this? 'Tis common in Popular Discourse to speak after this manner. But, as I observed before

Dr.

Dr. C— may easily know if he will, that the far greater part, the generality of Divines whether Ancient or Modern, rather suppose an intermediate State: In which the Joys or Torments that they partake are not assign'd in the way of Judicature, and by a Judicial Sentence; but rather by some Antecedent Act of Government, without any Solemnities of Trial. And this methinks is a satisfactory Answer, to his pretended Inconsistency; for where there is no Judgment at all, nor any Judicial Sentence pass'd, assigning Men either to Heaven or Hell before the General Judgment, there is no Room for the Objections that *Estivius* brings; and this seems to be the Truth of the Case. For I agree with him, that to suppose the Punishment denounced by the Law, to be inflicted before the Trial, and the Sentence of Judgment, looks somewhat like Injustice, or would at least make that Judgment needless. And for this very Reason I do not believe, that the deceased are immediately consign'd either to Heaven or Hell, or are made either Miserable or Happy by any Judicial Sentence, or Act of Judgment. But then, as a Prisoner before his Trial may either be enlarged or confined to a Dungeon, according to the Crimes he stands charged with; so I do believe, that immediately upon the Death of any Man, his Soul has its appointed Place where it is to expect the Last Judgment, and in which it may, and does without any Trial, or Judicial Sentence, partake of Joy or Torments, tho' those are not so absolutely Compleat and Perfect as they will be after the General Resurrection and Judgment.

Well, but says Dr. C—, you *ought to prove Positive*— *Far. Th.*
ly from Scripture, that things shall be so. You may *sup- P. 70.*
pose as many Worlds as Stars in the Heavens; And a

A Farther Vindication of the Soul's

great many Questions, and Suppositions may be put; but still they make no Proof at all. But with *Estibius's* Favour, He that undertakes to make good, that any Doctrine is inconsistent with the Principles of Christianity, takes the Proof upon himself. And it is a sufficient Answer to all such Objections, to shew that the whole pretended Absurdity is founded on such Suppositions, as do not necessarily follow from the Doctrine in Dispute, nor are held by those who believe it. Does the Belief of an Immortal Spirit in Man necessarily prove that it must immediately upon Death, be Adjudged to Heaven or Hell? Or do we all unanimously believe the one, who believe the other? If we did, Dr. C—'s Argument would have some Force. But when all the pretended Inconsistency is founded only on such Principles as are neither necessarily consequent upon our Belief, nor unanimously held by us, it can be of no Force at all against us: Could Dr. C— make it appear by any good Reasons, that an Immortal Spirit in Man and a General Judgment cannot consist together, he had spoken to the purpose; but if he does not this, he does nothing: An inconsistency founded only on some Popular Mistakes, that have been received by some People, and exploded by most of those who write accurately of things, will never serve his turn.

Not but that if Dr. C— be very desirous of knowing why we Believe the Souls of the Deceased to be in Joy, or in Misery before the Resurrection: we have Reason for such a Belief. It is, because we find that our Saviour and his Apostles, who knew the Doctrine of the Soul's being an *Immortal Spiritual Substance*, distinct from the Body, to be a received Principle, do yet express themselves in such a manner, as to the Owners of such a Principle must needs import thus much.

This

Separate Existence and Immortality.

43

This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise, and I have a desire to depart and to be with Christ; and we know that while we Sojourn in the Body, we are Absent from the Lord, but are willing rather to be Absent from the Body and Present with the Lord; are Expressions that plainly intimate the Souls of Good Men to be in a State of Joy immediately upon their Departure from the Body. And as the Reason is the same as to the Torments of the Wicked, so the Scripture seems to Hint at least such a Principle, when it says, *That Judas by Transgression fell, that he might go to his own Place.* Luk. 23.
Phil. 1.
2 Cor. 5.
6, 8.
Act. 1. 25.

But still Dr. C— thinks the Justice of God concerned in this Opinion, as it supposes Sinners of the same degrees of Guilt, suffering different degrees of Punishment, by their being in Misery a much longer time than others, while some die Thousands of Years before others, and yet all continue in their Miserable State from the Hour of their Death until the General Resurrection. To which I Answer, by putting a like Case. Suppose Men, equally guilty of the same Crime, are Sentenced to Banishment during Life, and one of them Dies in six Months time, and the other lives in his Miserable confinement six and twenty Years. Here is indeed a different continuance of the Misery to which they are Condemned, but such as does not at all impeach the Justice of the Sentence; in that this was perhaps by Accident, or else by the ordinary course of Nature became inevitable. So here, let us but suppose, what according to our Principles has nothing Unreasonable or Absurd in it; that God has by a Decree, as Ancient, perhaps, as our first Covenant with *Adam*, or the Promise of a *Messiah* upon his fall, appointed all the Soul's of Impenitent Sinners to be Delivered up to the Custody of the Devil, till the last Resurrection and Judgment.

ment, but the Just to be rescued from him, and put under the Protection of Christ their Head and Governour, till the same Judgment; now tho' in such a Case the Duration and Time of their Joy or Misery be different, as Men die sooner or later; yet this can no way blemish the Justice of God. What happens not thro' any Partiality to either, but only from the Order of things settled Antecedent to their Crimes or Sufferings, ought not to be Pleaded as at all disagreeable to the Infinite Justice of the Almighty.

But to make short of this Matter, there is nothing consequent upon our Opinion of the Soul, however inconsistent it is esteem'd with a General Judgment, but what the Scripture declares very plainly, (allowing for the difference between Penitent Sinners, and Apostate Spirits) to be the Case of fall'n Angels. They Sinned a great many Ages ago; And it is expressly said, That *Everlasting Fire*, the same in which Wicked Men are to be Tormented, was *prepared for the Devil and his Angels*. And yet instead of being actually in that Fire as yet, St. Jude tells us, that they are *reserved in Everlasting Chains of Darkness, unto the Judgment of the Great Day*. That they expect this Judgment, and the Consequence of it is Plain, from the Question that one of them put to our Saviour: *Art thou come to Torment us before the time?* There is a Time then allotted for their Torment, and it was not then come. Where their Abode is in the mean while we cannot certainly determine. 'Tis a place in Scripture called *the Deep*; and a Place in which they are in Misery even before the General Judgment, tho' sometimes they are admitted to get Enlargement from it. For which Reason, the Devils that Christ was casting out, *intreated that he would not command them to go into the*

Matt. 25.
34.

v. 7.

Matt. 8.
29.

the Deep. Luk. 8. 31. In this Deep then we may suppose, that they are reserved unto the Judgment of the Great Day ; and yet in Misery and Unhappiness, tho' not as yet Sentenced to that Everlasting Fire prepared for them. And yet This must not be thought Inconsistent with, or Destructive of the Reasons of a General Judgment ; because the one is undeniably declared in that Gospel which has made known the other. And yet, This is just what we suppose concerning the Souls of Wicked Men ; who, for ought we know, may be kept in the same Deep with those Evil Spirits. And if we suppose too, That the Souls of Good Men are by the Power and Mediation of Christ, delivered from that Misery, and reserved in some better Place of Joy and Comfort till their Solemn Trial ; This is not unsuitable to their usual Expression of *being with Christ, and Present with the Lord* : Which as they seem not necessarily to include their being actually in Heaven, must the rather be understood of some peculiar Act of Favour and Protection. But here I must expect Dr. C— will be upon me. This intermediate State is the Foundation of Purgatory, and Prayer to, and Invocation of Saints. And this is the

3. Objection. That our Doctrine is by these means Prejudicial to Christianity, tho' not entirely Destructive of it. I had Answered, That this gives no just Far. Th. p. 90. 91. Countenance to Purgatory, nor by the same Reason to Prayers for the Dead, while we own the Condition of the Deceased to be unchangeable, and not to be altered by the Prayers of the Living. For the true State of the Dispute between us and the Church of *Rome*, does not consist in Granting or Denying an intermediate State, but whether the Condition of Men in.

in their State is so changeable, that the Prayers of the Living can bring the Deceased out of Misery into Happiness. This we do not grant, and while we do not, there is no just Countenance to Purgatory. But, says Dr. C—, They will *insist upon the condition of Deceased Souls not being thus unchangeable*, and then you must enter into Dispute with them, while my Notion *in an easier way, would more demonstratively Convince them*. But must I give up a known Truth to avoid the ill Consequences that Pertinacious Men may infer from it? If I must, I may avoid all Controversie with the *Romanists*, by giving up the Authority of the Scriptures. If I must not, This Objection is not Pertinent, in that the Determination of the Point does not depend upon it. If our Opinion be true, and a useful comfortable Truth, I ought to adhere to it, notwithstanding any Superstitions that Men may fall into thro' their Perverseness in their Mistakes about it. And whether it be such a Truth or no, is not to be determined by this consideration, but by the Force of Arguments offered above. I only add, That Prayers to, and Invocation of the Saints, have no just Countenance here, while the Dead themselves have not yet attain'd to Heaven, but are in an intermediate State, in which we know not what Cognizance they have of what we do. There are one or two things more that Dr. C— mentions, tho' there is little in them. As,

Far. Th.
p. 151.

4. He Pleads that our Notion makes void one of the chief Promises of God. *The Scripture says, that Eternal Life is the Gift of God, given thro' the Merits of Christ, but if Man has a Distinct Immortal Soul, this is Eternal Life, and so our Obligation to God for his Gift is rendered void.* But can Dr. C— pretend to be ignorant, that

Life and Death in Scripture Language, signifie Happiness and Misery. Is not the *Second Death* plainly described to be a State of Misery and Torments; and not of utter Dissolution and Insensibility? And does not *Eternal Life* manifestly denote *Happiness*, and not Life alone without it; when it's set by Christ himself in Opposition to those that are *to go into Everlasting Punishment*? This then is God's Gift by Jesus Christ, that we should not only Live, but be happy for ever. And Life without that Happiness is, I am fully perswaded, whatever Dr. C— may think to the contrary, that Miserable Wretched State, from which Christ by his Meritorious Passion has delivered us.

There is nothing then in our Opinion of the Soul, that does make void this Gracious Promise and Gift of God, if Dr. C— will understand it Right, as the Scriptures themselves have delivered it to us. This is rather a Fallacious Quibble, than an Argument. And his

5. And Last Objection is still worse; *viz.* That we perplex, if not make void the Mystery of Christ's Incarnation, which we look upon to be the Union of a Spiritual Being to a Material one. For, if this be easily conceivable, as we grant it is, as to the Union of the Soul and Body of Man, how can we pretend the other to be a Mystery? Not to trouble Dr. C— here to explain, how any thing can be granted *easily conceivable*, the *Modus* of which is Confessed to be difficult: let him take this as a more Satisfactory Answer to his trifling Objection; That the Great Mystery of Christ's Incarnation is not meerly in the Union of a Spiritual Substance with a Material Body; but in the Union of such a Spirit, as is confessed to be God, and to be of Infinite Perfections, with the Mortal Nature of Man. This is a Mystery

so Infinitely surpassing any thing that is pretended in the Union of the Soul and Body of Man, that had not the Number of Dr. C—'s pretended Contrarieties and Inconsistencies run very low indeed, I could hardly imagine how these two last came to find any Place among them.

I have thus then examin'd the most important Objections on Dr. C—'s side, and I think with a regard to Truth, as Impartial and free from Prejudice, as he himself could wish me to have done. And I do now upon the whole, with all sincerity assure him, That I am so far from seeing any thing in the Belief of the Soul's Distinct Existence as a *Spiritual Substance*, inconsistent with the Last Resurrection and Judgment, that I cannot see the necessity of either of them so much as Weakened at all thereby. Nor any one Doctrine of the Christian Religion at all Perplex'd, or made in the least Degree difficult, or unreasonable to be believed by our Opinion; which is more than I can possibly say of his.

Far. Th.
p. 133.

I take no farther Notice of his *Latin* Philosophical Axioms, than they are concerned in these Objections, in that the rest of them are only Rules and Observations made of the Established Laws, and Operations of Matter and Motion in Sublunary things, but have no Force or Truth in them, when applied to Spiritual Substances. They are indeed jumbled together in an odd manner, for one that pretends to Accuracy in Philosophy; and would admit of an easie Answer, did the Determination of this Controversie at all depend on them. But as I think it does not, I shall proceed to somewhat that seems more Material. And that is, The Difficulties that arise in consequence of Dr. C—'s Notion of the Soul, who making it to be nothing else but a
Power

Power of Life impress'd by Almighty God upon the Body; in Consequence of that Opinion, makes Death to be a Total destruction of the Man, and with no Possibility of Joy or Torments to the Dead, before the Resurrection of the Body. Which Notion seems to me attended with these considerable Absurdities.

1. To allow of no Adequate Punishment for the Sins of Men in a State of Revolt and Apostacy, as antecedent to the Covenant of Grace by Jesus Christ. And the Force of this Objection turns upon the Determination of this short Question. *viz.* What had been the Final Condition of Sinful Men, if Christ had never Redeemed us? Dr. C—'s Notion can admit of no other Answer than this: That Men must then have died like the Beasts, without any future Recompence at all. But then I must say, That in Consequence of such a Principle, God had provided no Adequate Punishment for the actual Transgressions of Wicked Men, which to me seems wholly Inconsistent with his Justice. This is a Difficulty hard to be gotten over; that while Man is under a State of Grace and Redemption, the severest of Punishments should be decreed for Sinners; and yet while under a State of Sin and Vengeance, there should be no sufficient Punishments decreed at all. For I must say, That according to his Notions, a great part of the actual Sins of Men had gone Unpunished, if Christ had never Redeemed us. In this World they have not their Punishment, and if Christ had not Redeemed us, there had been no other.

The best Answer that Dr. C— makes to this Objection is, That God in all these things, Acted and Ordained *with a regard to a future Resurrection and Judgment that were to be by Jesus Christ.* And this is indeed

H

Evading,

Par. Th.
p. 78.

Evading, but not Answering my Question, which is put upon a Supposition, that there had been no Redemption by Christ, and in consequence of that, no Resurrection, no Judgment. And such a Supposition can be neither Impertinent nor Improper; in that it is from the Miseries of Mankind by their Sins, that the Great Work of our Redemption takes its rise. And it is a new Mystery in it, that a State of Sin should be supposed, from which Man should want to be Redeem'd; and yet in that State no sufficient Punishment for Sin provided. This is contrary to our Natural Apprehensions of the Divine Justice, and yet the Inevitable consequence of Dr. C—'s Opinion, which can admit of no Future State, but in consequence of Man's Redemption. Temporal Death is not to be considered here, in that it's the Punishment of *Adam's* Sin only, and not of ours. This Consideration will still have more Force if we add,

2. That it derogates also from the Greatness of God's Love in our Redemption. For whereas this great Mystery is set forth as the greatest Instance of Divine Love, in the Deliverance it procures: The Greatness of that Love must be seen in the Greatness of the Misery that it delivers us from. Now this Dr. C—'s Notion does in the Consequence of it bring to nothing more, than only Restoring us from the State of Death, or Non-Existence. And tho' I confessed before, that even this is a Blessing and a Favour; yet far short of what we must acknowledge our selves to have received, who believe our selves Redeemed from a state of Misery in Death. Ay, But says Dr. C—, this is just, as *suppose I break my Leg, it is then indeed an Act of Love and Compassion to Cure it; but* for

Br. Vind.
p. 47.

Far. Th.
p. 81.

but for all that, I will beg Mr. Surgeon's Pardon, and keep my Leg whole if I can. That is, He acknowledges that our Notion represents the Redemption of Mankind, to be the more extraordinary Act of Love and Pity; but the Opinion of a Soul's being in Misery, or Torment before a General Judgment to want Proof. But I would beg him to consider, whether the Proof already brought of the Soul's distinct Existence, compared with the several Expressions of Scripture about the Dead, do not look very like a Proof of this. The Scripture tells us expressly, that Christ suffered for our Offences, and bare our Sins on his own Body on the Tree, and came into the World to save Sinners, who hath delivered us from the Power of Darkneſs, and from Wrath to come. And what can Dr. C— make of all this? What is being delivered for our Offences, and bearing our Sins, but suffering to deliver us from the Miseries due to them? And what are those Miseries which our Sins bring on us, or Expose us to? Death, it's true, we shall be deliver'd from in a Resurrection by the Power of Christ. But Death is not the Punishment of our Sins, but of Adam's. And what is that Power of Darkneſs and Wrath to come, from which Christ has delivered us? It cannot properly be said according to Dr. C—'s Notion, from the Wrath of God in the World to come: in that, if his Opinion were true, there had been no such World to come without it. And Redemption according to his Principles, does rather bring us to that Wrath, of which otherwise there had been no Danger. In short, to bear our Sins, and to deliver and save Sinners, are Expressions, that so plainly in themselves, and so evidently in the intention of the Divine Writers, imply Misery due to Iniquity, and our Deliverance from

the Misery by the Atonement of Christ Jesus; that I appeal to all Men, whether such Expressions be not best accounted for, by our Notion and Opinion of the Deceased Souls? Or how they can, without Force and Violence, be Reconciled to such a Principle, as allows no sufficient Punishment for Sins, but what comes by that Redemption? How can that be call'd Redemption, if there were no Miseries to have been suffered by Wicked Men for all their Sins without it? Pity alway supposes Misery; How then can this be called an Act of Love, and Grace, and Compassion to Sinners, if there were no Miseries to have been suffered by them from their Sins without it? Or why is not that with equal Right, called a Covenant of Vengeance, as well as a Covenant of Grace; and why might it not proceed as well from Hatred, as from Love and Pity: had it, what Dr. C—'s Notion must suppose, besides the Conditions of our Happiness, exposed us to Torments and Wrath, from which, without that Act of Grace and Love, we had been free? And tho' Dr. C— is pleas'd to say, That *this does not at all relate to the Controversy*, I must beg leave to tell him, That it is of great Importance to the Impression that Christianity should make on the Minds of Men, that his Opinion be not received. But,

Har. Th.
p. 82.

3. Another Objection against Dr. C—'s Opinion is, That it much increases the Difficulty of believing the Resurrection of the same Persons from the Dead. For, if we shall neither have the same Souls nor the same Bodies that we have now; How can we possibly be the same Persons? And as we have no Souls now, we cannot have the same Souls then. And
Dr.

Dr. C--- says plainly, that there is no need of our having the same Bodies then, but other *Bodies with the same Qualities* will serve our turn. But with his Favour, That alone will not make us the same Man: For an Identity of Qualities, is but an Identity of Resemblance, not a Personal Identity. Two Bodies may have the very same Qualities, but that will not make them both one Man. Qualities may, and do distinguish one Body from another, but our Question is not merely this. But how a Person Dissolved can possibly become the same Person again, without having the same Numerical Principles of Personality; which, be they what they will, must have for their Subject the same Body, or the same Soul, or both. The most plausible Argument against the necessity of our Rising with the same Bodies, is from our continuing the same we were twenty Years ago, altho' we have not now the same Particles of Matter. But then there are two things in this Life, that preserve us the same Persons. 1. That we continue without any Dissolution. Not that we have the same Qualities, and Qualifications, for that we seldom have; but the Body has never yet been utterly dissolved. 2. But the Second and chief thing is, That there continues still the same Principle of Life, Action, Sensation and Self-consciousness in this Body. So that the Person which suffers now for an Offence committed 20 Years ago, suffers as the same Person that committed the Offence then. And what was then the Author of the Evil of the Action, is now the Subject of the Evil of Punishment and Torments. And if upon this Dissolution of the Body by Death, I still keep the same Subject of Life, Self-consciousness and Sensation of Joy, or Sufferings
by

by a distinct Immortal Soul; I thereby continue so much of the same Person, that even altho' *that Soul was to enter into a Brute*, as Dr. C—— puts the Supposition, I ought in Wisdom to provide against my suffering in it. So much does our Doctrine of an Immortal Soul contribute to make the Resurrection of the same Persons credible, and more easie to be comprehended, than that Notion which entirely dissolves the Body, and allows no Soul, and denies the necessity of a Numerical Identity of either.

God may if he will, as I said before, *Form new Bodies out of the Earth at the end of the World, and put new Life into them*; but if there be among them neither my Individual Body, nor my Individual Soul, I my self cannot be there. This is Creation, not Resurrection, which requires the same Individual Person to be restored again. *Hey day! Creation*, says Dr. C——; *That is a Formation of something out of nothing, but Man was formed out of the Dust of the Earth, and therefore this is not Creation*. Pardon, good Dr. if every Creature of God was good, when St. Paul spake of Meats, and those Meats were Created of God to be received with Thanksgiving; there may be Creation when things are Formed, not out of nothing, but of Pre-existing Matter. But our Controversie is of more Moment, than a Nicety about words: And therefore I would recommend it to Dr. C—— to consider, what an insignificant thing his Resurrection is. Who will be afraid of any Account that they may give, or any Judgment that they must pass, or any Suffering they must endure in another Body, and with no Soul? That which to me is the Formidable thing in all these Doctrines, if I am Wicked, and

and the Comfort, if I am Good, is, That whether in Life or in Death, I still continue under the same Apprehensions and Expectations of Torments on one hand, and Joys on the other; and thus look and wait the coming of my Lord to Judgment: But what is to be expected in another Body, and without my Soul, will not much affect me, because it cannot possibly be I my self. Here is a direct Inconsistency with the Doctrines of Christianity; in that the Resurrection of the same Person cannot be possible by another Body and no Soul. And let Dr. C— consider well, what Mischiefs may flow from such a Principle.

4. A fourth Difficulty charg'd upon his Notion, is, The Disagreeableness of it to the Sense of the Ancients about Christ's Descent into Hell, and their Opinion of the State of the Dead. This he has said nothing against, and so I have nothing here to add to it.

5. The Last Difficulty is the Mischief of his Notion in the tendency of it to countenance Men in Sin, by taking off those Apprehensions of Torment which they have been taught, and I think on good Grounds, to expect immediately upon their Decease. For, without telling them that they are to go immediately to Hell, it is a Consideration of no small Terror for them to reflect, that they must lie perhaps in the Custody, and under the Insults of Devils; but however in black Despair, and bitter Remorse; and in the sharp Convictions of Conscience and Self-condemnation; in Fears and Terrors, and dreadful Apprehensions waiting the coming

ing of their Judge to Sentence them to Eternal Con-
 demnation of both Body and Soul in Hell. All this which
 is consequent upon our Opinion of the Soul, his Re-
 prievs and Exempts them from: And in that miti-
 gation of their Terrors, countenances them in do-
 ing Evil. No, says Dr. C—, This is nothing, *there*
is no time in Death, and a Thousand Years are but as
one Minute between that and Judgment. Soft, Good
 Sir, That Maxim is neither Literally nor Virtually
 true. You know it is not strictly true, and you
 may know by many Instances, that it is not Virtu-
 ally so. Distant Future Evils do oftentimes but
 little affect Men. A very near Prospect of Death
 will often awe the boldest Sinners, and in Ten
 Thousand Instances is found to work upon them;
 when all their Assurance of it shall be of no Efficacy,
 while they view it a great way off. So doubt-
 less in the Torments to be expected after it, if they
 are in any degree to begin immediately, Men will
 think themselves the more concerned to prevent them.
 Besides we are not only to consider how a State of
 entire Dissolution or Insensibility may be accounted
 by an indifferent Person in it self; but how the
 Living are likely to be affected by these different
 Apprehensions, which his Notion or ours must put
 them under. And I think it's plain from what we
 observe as to Death; that a Reprieve of expected
 Misery, lessens the Terrour of it, and Distant E-
 vils have but little Efficacy to restrain Men from
 Iniquity.

Well, but says Dr. C—, if this does countenance
 Sin, it's only *in the Reprobate and Hardened Sinners,*
whom no Terrour of a Future Judgment will affright,
but

but who are Resolved to Sin on, *Maugre all Terrours whatever.* But Sir, Those who harden themselves now, may hereafter be awakened; and he that to day seems a Reprobate, may in time become a Convert. We know not the Hearts of Men, nor the times of their being wrought upon; and therefore should be very cautious of Broaching any thing that may Countenance their continuance in Iniquity. If as *St. Paul* tells us, it is by *the Terrours of the Lord we perswade Men*: Such Sinners want those Terrours most, which you in part take off; and are likely to be the more emboldened by that long Exemption from Misery which you Proclaim to them. 'Tis a Matter of great Moment this, and deserves your *Second*, your *Farther*, your most Serious and Impartial Thoughts. It is not easie to account for all the Mischiefs that your Principles might bring on Christianity, if Men were led Universally to believe them. That they shall lie in the Grave entirely free from all Sense of Joy or Torment till the end of the World, and the General Resurrection, and then to rise to Life without a Soul, and with such a different Body, that they know not how it can be call'd their own. I cannot but recommend this once again to your most deliberate Considerations.

And having now done with this Controversie, for I think there is scarce any thing of Moment to be added New on either side; I will only beg leave to tell you, That to be so confident of the strength of your Proofs, that *nothing but express words in Scripture, saying, Humane Soul is an Immaterial Substance, &c. will convince you*: Shews you to have more of Obstinate Resolution, than strong Reason in this Cause. Inference and Conclusions from Scripture is in many im-
Far. Th.
p. 129.

portant Truths, the only Evidence that God has thought fit to allow us. Such I have endeavoured to lay before you, and think them sufficient to convince any Impartial Reasonable Man. And he that disdains to be convinced by such an Argument, will not only lose the Benefit of many Instructions and Informations which the Blessed Spirit of God has Exhibited in his Holy word; but he also casts an undue Reflection on that Method of Reasoning, and Argument which Christ himself used to the Sadducee in the very Case before us. For I must say again, it was this very Dispute about the distinct Existence of the Soul, that gave occasion to the Question put to Christ about the Resurrection. And if such an Answer as Christ used to Convince the Sadducees, be not sufficient to convince Dr. C—— without *express words, saying, The Soul is an Immaterial Substance*: there is no more to be done, but to leave him to his own Conceit; to sport himself with his own deceivings.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

PAge 5. Line 4. for *be* read *that*. p. 9. l. 14. dele *and*, 17. r. *Recommend*. p. 14. l. 14. r. *as a false*. p. 40. l. 3. r. *an Advantage*. p. 43. l. 19. r. *two Men*. p. 45. l. 16. *their* r. *the*, l. 20. r. *Protection in another Place*. p. 46. l. 1. *their* r. *that*. p. 52. l. 1. r. *that Misery*. p. 54. l. 2. dele *of*.

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

THE Sincere and Zealous Practice of Religion Represented; in Consideration of the Certainty of its Principles, the Reasonableness of its Duty, and the great Wisdom of Mankind in serving God; with Respect both to the Advantages of this Life, and the Recompence of the next. To which is Added, A Brief Account how those who incline to Religion may best bring their good Desires to good Effect. By *John Turner, M. A.*

3
1
2
3
4

7-
3-
7-
4-

on-
efs
ith
of
ne
By